

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 25, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 25, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-56 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 35-39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 51 are rejected and claims 1-34 and 53-55 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Claims 40, 42, 44, 47-50, 52 and 56 are objected to, but are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 35-39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 51 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Claim 34 is amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 40, 44, 47-50, and 52 are amended to correct matters of form. More specifically, claims 40, 44, 47-50, and 52 have been rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, and therefore now allowable. Claims 42 and 56 remain dependent on rewritten independent claim 40, and therefore now allowable. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claim 18 is objected to because in claim 18, line 2, "the" should be "a" because there is no antecedent for "the texturizing chamber". According to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended claim 18 to provide proper antecedent basis. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 35-38, 45, 46 and 51 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 51, 69, 94, 95 and 70 of copending Application No. 10/099307. The Examiner states that a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome a rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting. Applicant has cancelled claims 35-38, 45, 46 and 51. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,670,571 ("*Dance*") in view of U.S.

Patent No. 5,401,319 ("*Banholzer, et al.*"). Applicant has cancelled claims 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 51. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)